



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/670,141	09/24/2003	Sean Michael Kane	1676 US	7391
7590	08/25/2005		EXAMINER	
Jeffrey S. Boone Mallinckrodt Inc. 675 McDonnell Blvd. P.O. Box 5840 St. Louis, MO 63134			DELCOTTO, GREGORY R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1751	
DATE MAILED: 08/25/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Gm ✓

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/670,141	KANE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Gregory R. Del Cotto	1751

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 May 2005.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 13-26 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-26 are pending. Applicant's arguments and amendments filed 5/2/05 have been entered.

Applicant's election of Group I, claims 1-12 in the reply filed on 5/2/05 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Claims 13-26 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made without traverse in the reply filed on 5/2/05.

Objections/Rejections Withdrawn

The following objections/rejections as set forth in the Office action mailed 2/25/05 have been withdrawn:

The rejection of claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Honda et al (US 2001/0034313) or Lee (US 2004/0067860) has been withdrawn.

Priority

Priority has been corrected and has been granted.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.

Art Unit: 1751

2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hara et al (US 2002/0128164) in view of Sahbari (US 6,455,479).

Hara et al teach a resist stripper containing a peroxide, a quaternary ammonium salt, and at least one member selected from the group consisting of an amine, a water-soluble solvent, and water. Suitable amines include a monoethanolamine, diethanolamine, triethanolamine, etc. See para. 22. Suitable solvents include N-methyl-2-pyrrolidone, ethylene glycol, etc. See para. 23. Additionally, an anticorrosive acid may be added including acetic acid, sebacic acid, adipic acid, etc. See para. 24. The water-soluble solvent is present from 1% to 50%, water is from 1% to 90%, the amine is from 1 to 50%, and the organic solvent is from 1 to 50%. See para. 25.

Hara et al do not teach a composition containing the specific amount of acid (corrosion inhibitor) or teach, with sufficient specificity a composition having the specific

Art Unit: 1751

pH containing a nucleophilic amine, a moderate to weak acid, a glycol ether, a cosolvent, and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims.

Sahbari teaches a stripping composition containing various ingredients including corrosion inhibitors such as triazoles, gallic acid, etc. which may be present in amounts from 0.01% to 10% by weight. See column 6, lines 10-45.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use an anticorrosive acid such as formic acid, acetic acid, etc., in amounts recited by the instant claims in the compositions taught by Hara et al, with a reasonable expectation of success, because Sahbari teaches a similar cleaning composition containing anticorrosive agents in amounts recited by the instant claims and Hara et al teach the use of anticorrosive acids in general.

Note that, with respect to the mole ratio of acid to amine and pH of the composition as recited by the instant claims, the Examiner asserts that the broad teachings of Hara et al in combination with Sahbari suggest compositions having the same mole ratio of acid to amine and pH of the composition as recited by the instant claims because Hara et al in combination with Sahbari teach compositions containing the same components in the same proportions as recited by the instant claims.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to formulate a composition having the specific pH containing a nucleophilic amine, a moderate to weak acid, a glycol ether, a cosolvent, and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific proportions as recited by the

instant claims, with a reasonable expectation of success and similar results with respect to other disclosed components, because the broad teachings of Hara et al in combination with Sahbari suggest a composition having the specific pH containing a nucleophilic amine, a moderate to weak acid, a glycol ether, a cosolvent, and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims.

Response to Arguments

With respect to Hara et al, Applicant states that Hara et al does not disclose the amount of acid in the amounts recited by the instant claims. Note that, as indicated above, the Examiner has made a new rejection which relies upon a secondary reference for the amount of anticorrosive acid added to the composition taught by Hara et al. Clearly, one skilled in the art would be motivated to use an amount of acid as recited by the instant claims in the composition taught by Hara et al when using the teachings of Sahbari as a secondary reference.

Conclusion

2. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Remaining references cited but not relied upon are considered to be cumulative to or less pertinent than those relied upon or discussed above.

Applicant is reminded that any evidence to be presented in accordance with 37 CFR 1.131 or 1.132 should be submitted before final rejection in order to be considered timely.

Art Unit: 1751

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory R. Del Cotto whose telephone number is (571) 272-1312. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. thru Fri. from 8:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yogendra Gupta can be reached on (571) 272-1316. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Gregory R. Del Cotto
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1751

GRD
February 20, 2005